

disappointment that we have not passed a budget. It has been 27 years since we have had this budget process in place in the Senate. This is the first time we have not had a budget plan passed out of the Senate.

If we are going to begin to talk about the need for various programs, it would certainly be helpful if we had some idea of where our limits were. I happen to believe we need to work to eliminate our deficit spending. We need to work to make sure we are trying to hold down the growth in our total debt.

#### MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I think it is vitally important that the Senate pass a Medicare prescription drug benefit plan now. Our seniors need it, our seniors have been waiting for years for it, and our seniors deserve it now.

Medicare is a health care entitlement program for the elderly. Since Medicare was established in 1965, Congress has considered adding a prescription drug benefit to the program. In the 106th Congress, the Senate got serious about enacting a benefit but was unsuccessful in their efforts.

I hope the Senate is successful now. I am concerned, however, that the legislative process has been derailed. The majority leader decided to bring to the floor S. 812, the Greater Access to Affordable Pharmaceuticals Act. This legislation did not proceed through the Committee on Finance. In order for a revenue measure to not face a Budget Act point-of-order, legislation must proceed through the Committee on Finance. S. 812 did not. As a result, the Senate is left with assuming budget points-of-order against any and all revenue legislation as we continue debate this week.

This is unacceptable. Seniors need drug coverage now. But the Senate majority has stalled the process. I hope seniors across the United States realize what has happened. This faulty procedure is robbing seniors of their drug benefit, which Congress and the President support but which the Senate is denying. Politics is superseding policy and that is simply unacceptable.

Because S. 812 did not proceed through the Committee on Finance, next week the Senate will take up the Graham-Miller, tripartisan, Hagel-Ensign, and Smith-Allard amendments in an attempt to provide a prescription drug benefit. We can only hope that the Senate will waive the budget point-of-order raised against these measures.

I have serious concerns about the legislation introduced by Senators GRAHAM and MILLER. Graham-Miller would be a temporary drug benefit, without secure financing. Graham-Miller would raise drug prices significantly, and Graham-Miller would not be able to be implemented as proposed. Graham-Miller would have an immeasurable and possibly unlimited cost.

Senator GRAHAM's bill does not even have a CBO score. That is another con-

cern I have. Preliminary estimates are that it would cost at least \$400 billion to \$800 billion over only 6 years. With two-thirds of seniors already obtaining their prescription drugs independent of Government, the Graham plan, frankly, is too generous at a time when Social Security solvency is at risk. According to CBO, Medicare beneficiaries will utilize \$1.8 trillion worth of drugs over the next 10 years. But \$1.1 trillion of this \$1.8 trillion will be paid by third parties, such as employers, States, and Medicare+Choice plans. Drug benefit proposals should focus on reducing the \$700 billion that will be paid by beneficiaries, not shifting the remaining \$1.1 trillion to the Federal budget. Seniors and taxpayers need a plan that provides a benefit that does not blanket seniors with costs completely covered and that does not break the Nation's bank. Graham-Miller's cost alone is reason to oppose it.

Other Senate drug proposals are less expensive. The tripartisan 21st Century Medicare Act of 2002, introduced by Senators GRASSLEY, SNOWE, BREAU, JEFFORDS, and HATCH, is estimated to cost about \$350 billion from the years 2005 to 2012. For days, weeks, and months, the Senate Finance Committee members and staff have worked tirelessly to write a bill that expands drug plan options for seniors and refines and enhances Medicare+Choice, Medigap, and other programs. This tripartisan bill will establish a universal, voluntary prescription drug benefit with affordable premiums and special protections for low-income seniors. The tripartisan bill would add a new voluntary fee-for-service option to fit modern health benefit packages, and it will strengthen another drug option under Medicare+Choice.

I am pleased that this tripartisan group of Republican, Democrat, and Independent Senators have joined together to provide a Medicare prescription drug benefit. The tripartisan plan expands drug options for seniors so they can choose a plan that fits their needs.

I also laud the work of Senators HAGEL, ENSIGN, GRAMM, and LUGAR who introduced the Medicare Prescription Drug Discount and Security Act. The Hagel-Ensign plan would offer beneficiaries a voluntary drug discount card that they could use to purchase prescription drugs. The bill would cover catastrophic drug costs for beneficiaries under 600 percent of the Federal poverty level, so that seniors making less than about \$53,000 will pay no more than \$1,500 to \$5,500 in out-of-pocket expenses. The bill also does not require monthly premiums, deductibles, or benefit caps. This bill is fiscally responsible, costing about \$150 billion over 10 years. I commend Senators HAGEL and ENSIGN for their work in offering this voluntary plan for seniors who need it most.

Senator SMITH and I also have introduced an amendment to S. 812 that would provide a Medicare prescription

drug benefit. Under our plan, the voluntary Medicare prescription drug plan, a Medicare beneficiary already enrolled in Medicare Parts A and B will have the option of choosing a new, voluntary prescription drug plan called Rx Option. This would cover 50 percent of their prescription drug costs toward the first \$5,000 worth of prescriptions that the senior purchases.

Currently, Medicare Part A has a \$812 deductible and Part B has a \$100 deductible. The Smith-Allard plan would create one deductible for Part A and Part B of \$675 that would apply to all hospital costs, doctor visits, and prescription drug costs. Once this \$675 deductible is met by the Medicare recipient, Medicare will pay 50 percent of the cost toward the first \$5,000 worth of prescription drugs that the senior purchases.

In addition, there is no benefit premium that would be required. Our plan is revenue-neutral. It is voluntary and will lower Medigap premiums by \$550 per year.

According to the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare, the Federal Government pays about \$1,400 more per senior if the senior has a Medigap plan that covers his Part A and Part B deductibles. This generally is attributed to the fact there is overutilization of hospital and doctor visits by the senior because no deductible is required under Medigap, and seniors are more inclined to visit the hospital or doctor without having to pay a deductible.

The Smith-Allard plan would require seniors pay a deductible. As a result, Medigap utilization will decrease and savings are achieved. In other words, there is an incentive created for the senior to go to the doctor when he needs to and not simply because it cost him nothing.

The Smith-Allard plan would work as a stand-alone drug benefit or as a complementing, additional drug benefit in conjunction with the other drug options about which I talked earlier. Our plan has a number of features that both the Graham-Miller plan and the House-passed Medicare Modernization and Prescription Drug Act do not have.

I would like to take a minute to go over a chart I put together on Smith-Allard. This is the Smith-Allard proposal as compared to current law, as compared to the Democrat plan referred to as Graham-Kennedy, and as compared to the House GOP plan for prescription drugs.

This is assuming the senior has Medigap supplemental insurance. Under current law, there is no deductible with the doctor or the hospital when they have Medigap insurance coverage.

With the Smith-Allard plan, there would be a \$675 deductible that would combine for both Part A and Part B of Medicare. Under the Democrat plan, there is no deductible, and in the House plan there is no deductible.

The prescription drug deductible is not covered in current law. It is combined in the Smith-Allard plan. There is no deductible in the Democrat plan and the House plan.

The average supplemental insurance premium under current law is \$1,611. Under the Smith-Allard plan, this comes to \$1,061. This remains the same under both the Graham-Kennedy and House GOP plan.

Prescription drug premium: Under current law, there is no coverage. Under the Smith-Allard plan, the prescription drug premium would be zero. Under the Democrat plan, the monthly charge that is talked about as \$25 a month, this amounts to a \$300-a-year premium, and the House GOP plan, which is \$30 a month, amounts to an annual premium of \$420.

Total annual premiums and deductible: Under current law, we stay at the \$1,611 level. Under the Smith-Allard plan, it is \$1,736. Under the Democrat plan, the Graham-Kennedy proposal, it is \$1,911. And the House GOP plan is \$2,281.

Let's look at the 10-year cost to the Medicare Program. Obviously, we do not have anything under current law. The Smith-Allard plan would remain at zero. The 10-year cost of the Medicare Program to the taxpayer is zero.

The Graham-Kennedy plan gets up to \$600 billion, and some estimates are running between \$400 billion and \$800 billion; \$600 billion is the number we use on this chart.

The House GOP plan comes in at \$350 billion. Some are estimating \$370 billion currently.

Who provides the drug benefit? Under current law, it is not covered. Under the Smith-Allard plan, Medicare provides that drug benefit. In the Graham-Kennedy bill, Medicare provides it. And under the House GOP, it is provided by the private insurance industry.

What is the comparison of drug coverage? Currently, there is no coverage. In the Smith-Allard plan, there is 50 percent coverage of all drugs up to \$5,000. In the Graham-Kennedy plan, the senior pays \$10 for generic drugs and \$40 for brand name drugs. Then in the House GOP, there is 20 to 30 percent coverage up to \$1,000 the senior pays, and then 50 percent between \$1,000 and \$2,250, and 100 percent over the \$2,250, up to \$5,000.

Let's look at the catastrophic coverage under these various plans. Under the Smith-Allard proposal, it is optional. Seniors can decide whether they want to take it or not. Coverage could be provided with savings if they decide to take that optional provision. In the Graham-Kennedy plan, it is over \$4,000, and in the House GOP plan, it is over \$5,000.

The nice thing about the Smith-Allard plan and one reason I am presenting it to the Senate today and have introduced the legislation with Senator SMITH is because it provides another option, and it is compatible with these other drug plans, particularly the first

one we talked about, the tripartisan plan, with an Independent, Democrats, and Republicans supporting the plan. Our bill is very compatible with that kind of a plan.

The amendment I will be offering with Senator SMITH is simply to provide seniors with an option so that as we move forward with this, it may be they do not want to pay the \$25-a-month premium or the \$30-a-month premium. They can say: I will offset that by increasing my deductibles in Part A and Part B on Medicare. I think it is the kind of choice we ought to offer seniors. It will balance any of the plans that happen to pass the Senate, and we ought to pass it in the Senate in order to give seniors some choice.

I am pleased the Senate is working to pass a prescription drug benefit for Medicare's 40 million enrollees. The Senate should be pleased that many Members have worked hard in recent years to add a drug benefit. We should be pleased that we are debating various proposals now. But our efforts are in vain if we do not pass a drug benefit this year. Our efforts are in vain, I repeat, if we do not pass a drug benefit this year. I urge my colleagues to set aside politics and pass a Medicare prescription drug benefit now.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak until the hour of 11:20 a.m. in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### AMERICA'S SENIORS NEED PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I want to talk about the delivery of prescription drugs to America's seniors. It is a subject that Senators have been talking about pretty much all week long, but people tuning in might wonder whether we are really making any progress toward getting a bill passed. That is what I would like to address this morning.

For quite a long time now, we have appreciated the fact that when Medicare was created, treating people with medications was not the preferred or first or primary method of treatment. So much of what Medicare covers today is the cost of invasive surgery, and the cost of just about every other kind of treatment except treatment through the use of medication or prescription drugs. Over the last 25 years, it has become increasingly common for physicians first to treat with medications, if possible. It seems second nature to us now. When Medicare was first established, that was not the case.

As a result, most prescription drugs were not covered as part of Medicare.

Over the years, people learned how to receive supplemental drug coverage through Medigap insurance and other ways to pay for prescription drugs, but the combination of the fact that Medicare itself did not set out to cover those drugs and, second, that the cost of drugs has obviously increased over the years has made it more difficult for some seniors to be able to pay for their prescription drugs, especially since, again, this is what their physicians are prescribing as the best way to treat them in many cases.

Add to that the fact that people are, fortunately, living longer today, but that the longer one lives, the more likely they are going to need to take various kinds of drugs, and we have a situation in which clearly it is time for Congress to respond with an inclusion of a Medicare drug benefit for all of America's seniors. We have been working on that now for quite a long time.

I find it interesting that on the Republican side there are three or four very good, somewhat different, ways of approaching this because Members on our side have been working hard to try to fashion a set of benefits we can afford and which will also provide the kind of care we want for our senior citizens, and now we have a number of options.

I sit on the Finance Committee. Last year, when Senator GRASSLEY chaired the Finance Committee, we began working legislation through the Finance Committee to try to bring to the Senate floor so we could provide a prescription drug benefit to Medicare. Then the control of the Senate changed.

Toward the end of last year, Republican members continued to meet and, in fact, began reaching across the aisle to meet with the Democratic members of the Finance Committee and also with the Independent Member of the Senate, Senator JEFFORDS, who had left the Republican Party and caucused with the Democrats but is identified as an Independent, and over the months, representatives of the Republican Party, the Democratic Party, and Senator JEFFORDS have come together on an approach that has now acquired the name, the tripartisan approach—because it is not just the two parties but, it is actually three parties—an approach that actually will deliver a very good prescription drug benefit to our seniors and a plan that actually is unique among all of the different ideas that have been brought to the floor because it can actually pass the Senate.

It has more than 51 votes in the full Senate, we believe, and it could pass the Finance Committee. Senator BREAU is one of the leaders in this coalition, and he has been a leader in the Finance Committee in support of this. So a great deal of work has been done to try to develop the kind of reform that is necessary to provide prescription drugs to our seniors.